THE IRREPRESSIBLE CONFLICT PAPELINED. DEMOCRACY AND DISUNION.

SPEECH OF CASSIUS M. OLAY.

Delivered on the Capitol Steps at Frankfort, Jen. 10.

Governor Mageffin in his message, and Vice-Presi-nt Breckingidge before the Kentucky Legislature, dent Brockinridge before the Kentucky Legislature, had assailed the principles and atms of the Republican party. Those Mr. Clay aspired to defend. Following the event of John Brown's raid and execution, the suppression of The Free South newspaper at Newport by violence, the expulsion of John G. Fee and associates from Madison County, Kestucky, and the design on the part of the Slave Oligarchy to perpetuate the sign of terror in all the South, it was generally given out that Mr. Clay would be silenced. The halter with which Brown was hung, the bloody lance which he used in buttle—a present from Gov. Wise to Gov. Magoffin—was freely handed about in Frankfort. While a central journal epenly put it that if Clay was allowed to speak in the Capitol, Kentuckians would be proved

be cowards.

Mr. Clay did not ask for the Representatives Hall; but it was generally ceded that by tacit consent be should occupy it, and the door keeper, Mr. Grey, promized to have it open and lighted up. But at the appointed hour the Hall was closed and dark, the night was ed hour the Hall was closed and dark, the lagut was gloomy and a storm threatening, the gas lights of the city were darkened, and in the "very immense audidience," as described by the reporter of The Loinsville Journal, none spoke above a whisper. As Mr. Clay rose, innumerable lights were brought and distributed unknown hands throughout the crowd, and for re than three hours he was listened to emid profound silence or occasional applause. The difficulty of arranging his references makes the report of the speech lose much of its unity; but truth is considered of more importance than rhetorical arrangement.

found sileone or coessional applause. The dimentity of stranging his references makes the report of the speech lose muce of its unity; but truth is considered of more importance than rhetorical arrangement.

Kertuckians I—That most profound and philosophical historian, in my opinion, of all ages—dibbon—speaks of courage, and sincerity, or its equivalent, truth, as the greatest of human virtue. The brave man, relying on his courage, never questions that of another. Those who know me, know full well I am not in the habit of speaking of my courage, nor have I indulged in that other—what I consider a bad habit of Kentockians in general—of speaking of their courage. I will, however, transgress my ordinary rule and speak of it to-night. If I thought—if I had thought that yon, whose blood has illustrated every battle-field from the beginning of our government to this day, were wanting in that virtue, and if I did not know that your illustrious ancestors, beginning with Boone and Kenton, down to this day, possessed this virtue; that I was in the I nd of the McKees, the Breckin-ridges, the Clays, the Crittendens, and a heat of other mean that have made you illustrious among men, then I might question your courage; but, it is because that I know that I am here, and among such men and in Kentucky, that I speak here to-night. The brave are always generous—adways and placing implicit confidence in this great fundamental truth, I have never feared to go forth through all this broad and glorious land of ours, relying upon the justice and magnaninity of Kentuckians. I never asked, I never cared, whether they were Democrata, Republicans, Americans of any other party denomination. Thank God, geolessen, this trust of mine has never been falsified. Whether I stand in your State House—whether I an aurrounded by light or covered by darkness, I feel equally safe while I am among Kentuckians. Genilemen, there are some peculiar circumstances attending this, my address to-night, that call for allusions that I am not in the habit of maki NO PERSONAL FEELINGS ENGAGED.

No PERSONAL FEELINGS ENGAGED.

Some sentlemen have supposed that, inasmuch as the publication which I made stated that I would here, in this place and at this time, respond to the message of Gov. Magoffin, and the late speech of your Senator clock, Mr. Breckinrilge, I had some personal feelings against those distinguished gentlemen, and that some personal or private ends were to be subserved at this time by attacking these gentlemen. Nothing was further from my purpose. The only inauguration that ever I attended, and I am now 49 years of age, was the isauguration of Gov. Magoffin. I learned to respect him from what I heard of him and what I had seen of him. I regard him as a brave and generous man. So far as the distinguished Sonator elect from Kentucky is concerned, all men who know me, know that among all the distinguished families of which Kentucky beasts, that I have always been proud of the Breckinridge name. I have from carriest life looked to to one portion of them as the guides and pilots of my political opinions. I have been personally associated with them; my family has been associated with them. I would not have said these things did not the occasion call for it, and did I not know that these insinuations have been made. I would say that of all men whose names are now presented to the American people by the Democracy with regard to the next Presidency, that I would not see any one attain that high position sconer than John C. Breckinridge of Kontucky.

EQUAL RIGHTS.

But wentlemen, neither Gov. Magoffin nor Senator

that I would not see any one attain that high possion sooner than John C. Breckinridge of Kentucky.

EQUAL RIGHTS.

But, gentlemen, neither Gov. Magoffin nor Senator Breckinridge are in fallible, and here, to-night, humble as I may be, unhonored as I am by having these doors closed upon me, a native of Kentucky and a man that belongs to one of the great parties of the United States, I mean to the the peer of the gentlemen, and equal in every respect so far as man is equal to man. God knows I do not detract from, nor do I envy the honors of these distinguished gentlemen, for whatever else can be said of them, it cannot be denied that they wear their benors gracefully and with becoming humility.

We must recollect that in this Commonwealth we stand on a broad basis of equality, and that, whatever other people may think; I have just as much right to be heard here and now as other men. Let my opinions be what they may, those opinions ought to be fairly canvassed, and if they are good, you should vindicate them by carrying them into practice, and if they be bad, then it is your duty to reject them and take those that are better.

Is SINCERELY AN EMANCIPATIONIST.

be bad, then it is your duty to reject them and take those that are better.

IS SINCERELY AN EMANCIPATIONIST.

As I said in the beginning, Gibbon says of the two greatest virtues, sincerity is one. This, gentlemen, whatever may be my abortcomings with regard to courage, I believe my sincerity and love of truth have not been questioned, and although I am here alone, one among a million, differing from you, it possibly may be, I know that you will credit that I believe that which I say I believe. I do not deny that, following the faith of our fathers, I am an Emancipationist. How would I commend myself, then, to you, if, having made this avowal everywhere within the limits of the Commenwealth, I should conceal or deny my sentiments? He is not a dangerous man that goes about spenly and above board, avowing what his sentiments are, but he is the dangerous man who, having sentiments, denies them, and you all know and feel this truth, and therefore it is because you believe I have been true in my atterance, that I have been able to stand comparatively alone in the State, telling these things. I am, upon this subject of Emancipation, just where I always was. But I do not now propose to enter into a debate as to whether we should, by gradual, and distont, and prospective means, get clear of Slavery. That I have done upon almost every stump and in every county of this Commonwealth, again and again. That is not the present issue. It example bedoed, and

you all know it, that I have always stood fairly and equarely upon the Constitution and the laws, that I have ever been obedient to law, a law and order man

you set know it, that I have always stood fairly and equarely upon the Constitution and the laws, that I have ever been obedient to law, a law and order man. THE MADISON COINTY MORS.

Now, geutlemen, for a few personal explanations, before I enter upon the vindication of the Republican party. Allow me here to state what has been and what yet is my position in my own county. There are distinguished gentlemen here, members of the Legislative, and outside of the Legislative body of Madison, and they know that that which I say is so, is cruth. I allude to the expulsion of the Rev. John G. Fee of Kentucky, and some nineteen other citizens of the Commonwealth by birth and choice, from their bomes; and their departure into exile.

Some three years since, on the Fourth day of July, when Mr. Fee returned again to the State after a temporary absence, he took the ground of what may be called the Radical Abolition party; that as a citizen of the Commonwealth, he owed no allegismee to the Continution and laws adopted and enacted on the subject of Slavery, and that he planted himself on the higher law of natural right. Although I accorded to him, that which I now believe and still assert, that he was honest—that he was pure in his purpose, that he was actuated by the highest love of Christian charity, yet it was not the ground upon which I stood, as I was a Constitution and law-loving man, I argued to him that I could not and should no longer stand by him, that I owed it to myself, and owed it to those laboring men of the country who held no slaves, whose cause I pleuded, and who confided in my leadership, to say to them that his was an unsafe and untennable position, and one which no man can hold; that it would inmediately bring them into conflict with the laws of the country, and that that position, ne matter by whom strengthened, could not be maintained. That is what I told him and them. Well now, I am no Don Quizote to go forward and fight the battles of every man who may venture an opinion upon the subject of Slavery; a

mine. That has been my whole course in connection with these parties.

It is untruc—it is absolutely and entirely untrue—on the other side, that I said that these men ought to be expelled from the Commonwealth. My position was one of strict neutrality. I said that while I was willing to see these men removed by law, if they violated any law, I was the sworm and eternal enemy of mobs, come they from what source they might. As soon as I heard that my name was connected with this transaction in that way—that I, who had fought against some eight or ten mobs, had come and sanctioned a mob—I immediately wrote to the editors of The Rick-snord Messenger and The Cincinnati Gazette utterly detwing it, and stating my views. What was the result? I was told eight days after it was done, and that, with the influence of hy name, he of The Messenger received my letter. In eight days he received my letter, at a distance of about an hour's ride from my office. That was what Judge Field told me, the day before I left. I have inquired with regard to the other letter to The Cincinnati Gazete, and have learned that there has been no such letter received in that quarter.

that quarter.

FEE AND JOHN BROWN.

What further? Mr. Fee is stated here as sanctioning the raid of Brown upon Virginia. [A voice on the outskirt—"Hurrah for Brown!"] Let us be honest! Fee is an exile; he is a native Kentuckian; he has a say from this, explained himself; and I have received a rejort of the speech at Brocklyn, and he there stated that while he admit ed the self-consceration—or in other words the devotion—of John Brown, he did not approve of his course, nor of his way of settling the

that while he sdmr ed the self-consecration—or in other words the devotion—of John Brown, he did not approve of his course, nor of his way of settling the Slavery question; in other words, he was opposed to insurrection. It was his view of the matter that he should go to slaveholders, and by argument induce them, and, by the force of divine teaching, persuade them to relinquish their hold upon the slaves.

Well, gentlemen, the report reaches us of boxes of Sharp's rifles having been transported through the ordinary channels of commerce to Beres. After these men are removed, we are now told that this was all a hoax. All I have to say about that is that it was a very sorry hoax. A sorry heax as far as Fee is concerned, doing him great injustice, imputing to him a criminal intent that he did not entertain and a purpose he did not deeign, and, so far as the Commonwealth is concerned, certainly it is a serry hoax.

So much in connection with that subject. I admit that a great many very repectable gentlemen in the County of Madison were in this affair—men for whose

county of Manson were in this standard the County of the character and lives I have a profound respect personally, and good feeling, and friendship. All I can say is that I regret on their account, this transaction, but more especially do I regret the influence this thing must have upon the large class of the people of the county, who were receiving the benefit of the education that these men were bestowing. Mr. Fee has nothing to lose—he will go where he will be paid as a time-serving man, or as other preachers of the Gospel of Chiss, but the number of the uneducated, constituting two-thirds of every born child in the mountains around that little colony, will be the sufferers by his sthence.

around that little colony, will be the sufferers by his absence.

THE NEW GOD.

We are told also in that report that this man imported a new god—that the slaveholders' god was not good enough for him and his associates, and this is attributed as a reproach. I knew the community in and around Berea when I was a boy, and I say that they were of the most vicious people that ever I did hnow; a drunken, tobaccochewing, whisky drinking people; debauchery and fighting could there be seen as plainly as the noon day sun. But, now, how is all this changed. The price of land has advanced as these gentlemen themselves admit, and morality reigns where disorder was predominant. Why, Sir, they have invaded the great State of Kentucky. How? With Sharp's rifice, pistols and bowie knives? No! that with the Now Testament, the school-house, the church and the saw-mill. It has even been objected that they were creeting a saw-mill. Where, before, the inhabitants dwelt in luts without windows and with mud floers, these men have introduced neat frame buildings. The children that before were indulging in idlences and dissipation, had been reformed, and were going to one of the best schools in Madison County, and in so saying. I nake no single exception. A certain degree of self-respect has been inspired in the people, and I venture to say that now there is no better people in the State than those who surround the colony of Beres, in the country of Madison. This is the new god they introduced. No, Sir! no new god has been introduced. It is the same God who before the long centuries created the heavens and the earth, who based His Throne upon the eternal principles of justice, and draped it in the undying beauty of harmony, liberty and love.

Well, gentlemen, with this personal explanation, I proceed to the main argument; and for the purpose of the vitry, I shall group together the allegations made by the Governor in his message, and the allegations made by the Governor in his nessage, and the allegations made by the Governor in his ness THE NEW GOD.

THE HIGHER LAW.

I understand the preliminary charge to be, in the first place, against what the distinguished Senator elect chooses to style the sentiment of a leading Republican of the United States, none other than Gov. Soward, the present Senator of New-York. Allow me to say, in the beginning, that I am not now, and neve have been, a partisan of Senator Seward; but, standing as he does, one of the representatives of the Empire State of New-York, that great State in which centers not only the commerce, but, I may say, the political intelligence of this country; admitted by on all hands to be as able a man, if not the ablest man, in the Senate in the United States, I say I would be doing injustice were I not to vindicate him from all that is unjustly imputed to him here. At other times and in other places that Senator is perfectly competent to vindicate himself, but bere in Kentucky where that vindication, on account of the censorship of the press, and in part, the refusal to allow the constitutional freedom of speech, he will hardly else be vindicated. I imagine I shall not be considered at all intrusive if I answer one of those charges made by those distinguished gentlemen.

The first denunciation that comes to us with regard THE HIGHER LAW.

themen.

The first denunciation that comes to us with regard to Mr. Seward is that he is a higher law man. Let us look at that for a moment—a higher law man. I intend to be very distinctly understood on this subject. In this time, as great issues—issues unparalleled in their correquences in the world—are dependent upon

the principles advocated by parties, you should not go away with doubt upon your minds, and you will allow me to go into details as to the true meaning of this term. I understand, then, gentlemen, in the common sense in which this term is used, by a higher law, an enactment which has the sacredness, the weight, and the power that belongs to no human law. Now, are we a Christian people, and is there any man that claims to be one of the common brotherhood of Christian ty that will deny that there is an overruling Providence who governs the universe by etc. nal and immutable laws which will prevail, the vicious or sacrilegious attempts of man to the contrary notwithstanding? There is no man who will be so regardless of the sentiment of Christian goodness as to utter any such idea as that. That, then, is the "higher" law which he acknowledged, and although I do not quote him from the book, I will state his position specifically: It was on the question of admitting the Torritory on the Pacific as a Free State, when he said that California ought not only to be Free, but a home for those driven out from the Slave States by the competition of unpaid labor, and for others driven from their homes by the competition of capital in the Free States; but there was a "higher law" even than Constitutions, to which this new Constitution should be conformed. I put it to every Demestat who hears me to night if that is not the true doctrine. If that be not so, how darea President Buchanan to make his recommendations to Congress, in the name of the Almighty (God?)

That, then, is the assertion. It is not an assertion

mendations to Congress, in the name of the Almighty God?

That, then, is the assertion. It is not an assertion that brings anarchy upon a community, but it is the only one principle of right and justice upon which the permanent good of the community can rest; it is the only permanent security for goods, property, reputation, lives, and opinion, and that was the sense in which Senstor Seward has uttered that eastiment, and he has again and again said when constitutions were made and laws enacted, not that we should cast igrominy and reproach upon them, or disobey them, but that we should acquirese in them, obeying them until they are changed by an intelligent constituency, acting through the Legislative Department of the Government. That is what he said, and there I stand by him, here and elsewhere, now and for ever, and there is not a man here to-night that does not stand by us, acknowledge that principle, that higher law, that reliance upon God, if he dare speak his honest sentiments.

We had a great deal of it at least, in this same Representatives 'Hall from which we are excluded to-night. The opposite party found there was a 'higher law,' and what was that Divine and Omnipotent God? It was S'avery! Slavery is higher than heaven and earth, and all constitutions and lawe. It is found in the Constitution we are told, or it is higher than that Constitution; and since that time we have heard nothing of the 'higher law' of Senator Seward. That thing is neutralized as chemists say—done for, as common men may urge.

THE IRREPRESSIBLE CONFLICT.

Another allegation is made against that Senator, intended to affect the Republican organization. It is

mon men may urge.

THE IRREPRESSIBLE CONFLICT.

Another allegation is made against that Sanator, intended to affect the Republican organization. It is now alleged that he has announced in his Rochester speech this much abused and cant phrase of a conflict that there is a cenflict between Slave Labor and Free Labor all through this Government; and that that conflict has been going on and will go on until one or the other utterly triumphs. That is the assertion. We acknowledge it—we own up. So let us examine it. Why, gentlemen, I understood that to be the declaration of our fathers in 1776. I understood that to be the cepanly avowed sentiment of Washington, Madison, and Jefferson. I understood that to the declaration of the resolution in Virginia, for which your candidate for Speaker of the Democratic party. Mr. Bocock, voted some years ago. I understood, furthermore, that that was the declaration of the late South Carolina Legislature; and above all, I have it here, taken from The Louisville Courier, the leading organ of the Democracy in Kentucky, made more than ten years ago. You would like to read it. Then will you have the goodness to turn to the files of that journal and see if I lie or not. [Cries of "Read it."]

[The speaker was interrupted by a heavy fall of rain, which forced him to retire into the rotanda of the State-Heuse.]

rain, which forced him to retire into the rotanda of the State-House.]

I will read the extract which I cut with my own scissors from The Louisville Courier, and by referring to the files of that paper, you will find it in the words which I to-night quote:

"I presume that it will not be desied that Free laber and Siave labor are incompatible. The white man is unwilling to labor by it eids of the slave, and the slave is equally averse to labering by the side of the white man. There exists a mutual repugnancy, and it follows, of cearse, that the mass of the labor of Restucky must be wholly the labor of the slave.

What think you of that, coming from this high Democratic authority? Mark the extent to which this gentleman carries the idea. Not only that there is a conflict, but he goes further. He says not only does the white man refuse to labor with the slave, but mark him well, he puts the slave above the Democratic white laborer of the common wealth and tells you the sentiment of the slave. What then is his conclusion? Why that in the conflict the "nigger" is to have precedure, so that Slave labor becomes entirely predominant in the commonwealth. What sort of Democratic teaching is that? In the name of God let us hear no more from the Democratic party, from Gov. Magoffin, or Vice Fresident Breakinridge, of this thing about the higher law or of this eternal conflict between Free and Slave labor.

THE IGNORED EXPLANATIONS.

But what did Gov. Seward say? With that characteristic injunctice which pervades too many of the Democratic injunctice which pervades too many of the Democratic injunctice which the pervades too many of the Democratic terials injunctice which pervades too many of the Democratic injunctice which pervades too many of the Democratic injunctice which pervades too many of the Democratic terials injunctice which pervades too many of the Democratic terials injunctice which pervades too many of the Democratic terials injunctice which pervades too many of the Democratic terials injunctice which the sto

THE IGNORED EXPLANATIONS.

But what did Gov. Seward say? With that charac teristic injustice which pervades too many of the Democratic journals, all the essential and philosophic qualifications of that expression have been withheld from the free white laborers of the South. What says Gov. Seward? Gov. Seward is a long-headed man. It is not denied that, whatsoever be may be, he knows what he is about. I heard one of the most distinguished jurists of the Commonwealth of Kantucky say what he is about. I heard one of the most distinguished jurists of the Commonwealth of Kentucky suy that he had the clearest and most philosophic head of any man in the Union; and what does this clear-headed man say? Does he leave it capable of porversion? Does be ray that because Slave labor and Free labor are incompatible, that the Republican party are going to enslave the white men of the South, or to interfere with the Slavery now existing in the South? No, sir! I deny that. I will state substantially what he does say. He says—and this is the important item which is left out by the Democratic press—that although this philosophical conclusion is going on, whether it is the work of this century or of the next, or of ten thousand centuries, he does not

which is left out by the Democratic press—that although this philosophical conclusion is going on, whather it is the work of this century or of the next, or of ten centuries, or of ten thousand centuries, he does not undertake to determine, nor can any other man; but he does say that it will take place; not by violence, not by John Brown raids, or conflicts and bloodshed; but peaceably by the amendment of the Constitutions and laws of the several Southern States themselves.

Is there a Democrat here unwilling to endorse that method of settling the conflict which Democratic papers assert exists? Suppose the great people of the Commonwealth of Kentucky choose to throw up the barbarian relic, who shall object? What says your Democratic authority? Have you not the right to do it? Is not that the idea? If it is not, here then is a "bigher law"—the law of S'avery, higher than that of all Democratic principles, that is, the same Divine right against which we fought in the British King, by which he claimed to rule over us without our consent. Whatever it be, be it even the aw of God, that is certainly not Democracy; it is despotism; it is the same old Divine right of Kings, and nothing else, disguise it as you may. So said G6v. Seward. So say I, and so says the Democratic party. The Republican party in the States of the Union say that it is none of their business—that if South Carolina, Kentucky, and Virginia choose to own slaves by voluctary consent, by the ascertained will of the majority of the people, let them hold on to the institution to all eternity, but, if the people of South Carolina, Georgia, or Kentucky, in their omnipotent power, as the sovereigns of their own country, choose to abolish it in a way that seems to them good, it is none of our business; in Gcd's name, let them do it. That is the doctrine I have always avowed in this Commonwealth, that inasemuch as I was a free-born white citizen of Kentucky, for the freedom of which my fathers stood, my sentiments were for the expulsion of this system from ou

stitutional rights as a citizen within the limits of my own jurisdiction.

That is the doctrine of the Republican party. So far as the Scuthern members of that party are concerned, they say that it is our business, and none of theirs; but so far as the National Government is concerned, it was established, as they believe, upon the basis of equal rights, and they say that into the free Territories of this Union Slavery shall not go. That is the ground—the distinctive ground of the Republican party; the only ground at issue between the great parties of the United States.

But, as I said before, I do not stand here to vindicate Gov. Seward, especially; only so far as allegations have been made against him, and through him have been intended to act upon and against the Republican party, have I alluded to this matter at all.

SEWARD AND JOHN BROWN.

party, have I alluded to this matter at all.

SEWARD AND JOHN BROWN.

While upon this subject, let us notice the connection attempted to be made between the Republican organization as concerned with that raid of John Brown upon Virginia; especially, perhaps, as it applies to this distinguished Senstor from New-York. Preliminary to this, allow me to state that upon the subject of Slavery there are three distinct parties in the United States. One that calls itself par excellence the Abolition party. That began under William Lloyd Garrison, and it is still kept up, partly by himself and partly by a greater

than be, this great beg-e-boo, Wendell Phillips. What are the doctrines of Cast party? It is fairly and squarely acknowledged by ".een the: the Constitution is a Siavery document, linamus." as fi binds all the millions of the Free States, in case of a service maniferication in the Southern States, to stand by and defend the rights of the master squame those of 'we shaw. They come frankly and squarely to the mark, and say that, inasemuch as from their education and the teachings of their consciences they are unwilling to carry out that part of the compact, that they go for a discolution of the Union; let the Slave State go the control the control of the Contr

speculator, saying that is not a subject of pathasis at them is the state and is now of an inferior race, and although the peet says "that the worm feels a pang as great as when a giant dies" yet we believe that is all poetry and not truth. The life of man and of woman is desirable as it is elevated and removed from the condition of the beast of the field that perisheth. Therefore it is, that when Great Britain held her supremacy over the immense millions of Budis, attempting by the despotic power of force, to rule it by no amalgamation of interests, taking it under a common protection and into a common glory, those untold millions of Eastern men, but ruling by force; and when upon the abstract proposition, every man was bound to confess that the right was on the side of the Indians, yet my sympathies were on the side of our common ancertors, and I imagine, that cutside of a few fantice, there were no men among these thirty millions of people that did not sympathize with the British—the white race as against the red and colored races of India, although, as I say, the right was on the side of the East Indians. Why? Because there was this development of our race, making them little less than god-like and divine, and because more especially these men had proved by their brutality, when a temporary success crowned their efforts, that they were unfit for liberty. The man who dares not to be generous, is not fit to sule or to be free, and we all rejoiced when we understood that the old British lion had risen triumphant over the Juggernautish flags of the people.

But we come down a page lower in history, and see Hungary when it struggled against a superior power, for that independence which Austria attempted to take away from them. When she fought for her God-given and mational rights of independence, all this was changed. Why? Because, by the liberation of their slaves they showed that they perceived a great principle, and in this acknowledgment of a great principle, which can be in some States done but by the aboli

publicen party of the States.

THE PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS.

Well, now, gentlemen, the great question is pertinently asked, "Why did a large portion of the Republican party sympathize with John Brown upon his death!" I care rot who the truth may cut, whether it be friend or foe, I stand here avowing, and if I know myself, as God is my helper, I intend to speak can didly and frankly, and above board, and I tell you why, men of Kentucky, there was this sympathy for John Brown. Your resolutions here to-day, as emanating from the Democratic State Convention, tell us that the Republican party is responsible for the John Brown raid. These are the resolutions, as they will go out in this Commonwealth; this is the meaning of the resolutions as they will go to the people of Kentucky, and as we read to the same purport in the Message of President Magoffin, and in the speech of the Vice-President. Thy edraw an inference, they have now abandoned the charge direct, and now they have now abandoned the charge direct, and now they have now abandoned the charge direct, and now they have now abandoned the same responsible. Well, now, gentlemen, if the responsibility rests upon principle, it goes further back than Seward, Clay, or any other Republican. Where does it go? To the year 1776, when your fathers and my fathers declared themselves free and independent of the British crown, and when they further declared that "all men are created free and "equal, and are endowed with certain inalienable "rights, among which are life, liberty, and the purint "of happinese." There rests the responsibility according to your resolutions, not upon us, but upon that bend of patriots. They were those who made the

transmitted to the saints. When you see, so me, and transmitted to the saints. When you see, so me, and transmitted to the saints. When you see, so doy to all of us, you accuse them, and uptil you are so day to accuse them, and are ready to go with John D. Calbern in the Senate of the United States, and say that the Declaration of Independence is all alle, I demur to your allegation. I say that you are estopped from alleging that against us. You ought not to strike at the interior while the superior workers for the blessings of life and liberty remain untouched—these glorious men who preceded us and gave us this Constitution.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY RESPONSIBLE.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY RESPONSIBLE.

KOW I will tell you where the responsibility came from the same Democratic party.

Kow I make that allegation, but I am not going to base it upon appealsation. I am not going to base it upon appealsation. I am not point to be added to be a support that party which, write all is appeared to the control of the provided and prove that, I say, if you give me the exportanity, let me bereafter shand infamous before men.

In the first place, what says the great American party of Kentucky—that party which, write all is animal and the same and t

If you are not you should be now, to venture such an arrest on as that.

It is history, gentlemen. You may tear me down from this stand; you may consecrate the principles which I here to-night delead, with my blood, if you please; but there will stand the the truth, and shat truth says that your ascertion is untrue, and that every Democrat knows it to be untrue, that the Compromise of 1820 was repealed by the Compromise of 1820, it is not true! And that it is not true has been avowed by the leading man that brought in and carried that bill, and who based his claim for the Presidency upon his devotion to the South. Thank God for pan, ink, and paper, sometimes used in this Commonwealth and others, although it is yory anti-democratic to use them, it seems.

his devotion to the South. Thank God for pan, ink, and paper, sometimes used in this Commonwealth and others, although it is vory anti-democratic to use them, it seems.

THE CAME OF GRAB.

Let us get along a little further. Why did shey want to repeal the Compromise of 1829? What is she matter, you Democrats of the United States? You have had the power, you say, all the time or almost all the time, from the foundation of the Government to the present day. You have had possession of the Government sinco its foundation, and where is the necessisy now of repealing this Compressite? Why, although you had the influence of the Government, both in its foreign and domestic policy, under pretense of subserving the rights of Slavery, and after a race of nearly three-questers of a contury, you are entirely behind. The North has grown in population and material and intellectual development far beyond your growth—"the sceptre is about to depart from Judan;" and what now? Why, we must repeal the Missouri Compressive, and take the start upon the progressive area of freedom, and check this power of conflict that The Louisville Courier and Gov. Seward speak of, and thus we may maintain our supremacy. That was it! Why, although you have divided the territory between the North and the South, that territory, you say, was purchased by the common blood and treasure, and therefore you have a right to go into it, and carry your slaves, when you do not allow the man who goes there from Ohio to carry them there. You have passed your laws prohibiting the African slave-trade; you monopolize the carrying of slaves among yourselves.

Although you divide that territory ceded to this Government, and make out of it Louisiana, Arkansas, and Missouri—three Slave States—and when the North conset to take possession of her portion of the bargain, consisting of all the territory north of 36° 30°, you say, "No, gentlemen; that game is out, we must have a new deal." [Laughter.] Well, now, my houset friend, what do you meen by a new deal? Are you going

Come on again, then! Mr. Doughas, for the purpose of gaining political power, to the loss of his constituents, and for the purpose of maintaining the interests of Slavery and slaveholders, against the great voting population of the country both North and South, and to make Slavery predominant, tolls us that the Missouri Compromise of 1820 is unconstitutional. This man, who a few years before had come into the Sonate of the United States, admitting that this Compromise was sacred and must not be touched, some two or three days after had a dream, and the result is that he finds out he had been mistaken, that our fathers were mistaken, that the action taken in 1788 was a mistake, that the action was the non-extension of Slavery, was recnacted under the Constitution in 1789, and carried out under every President from Washington to Monroe, in having declared that they had a right to restrain the spread of Slavery, was a mistake. He suddenly found out that our fathers did not know anything about the matter; their action was unconstitutional; it was unconstitutional to pass this great measure; and therefore the Democratic party repealed it, and Douglas helped them to do it.

Well, what did the Northern men do? What did the Republican party do? Why, they said, gentlemen, it is a lamentable thirg that the declaration of the Constitution itself gives the power expressly to

very first action under the Constitution in 1783 was an only recise of that power to "make all needful rules and rog under the respecting the territories," and following down as long the Presidents that were alive at the signing of the Constitution, lived, and coming to our own times as late as when Oregon was formed into a Territory, to a few days ago, this action has been deemed constitutional, when all at once these measures were found out to be based upon a fallacy, and it was discovered that we had no power to carry them out. What dis we do? Because we loved the Union—because we, North and South, had fought the cumon buttles of the country, and joined in the love of a common liberty, remading showher to shoulder, we will try the thing once more; we believe a per Labor is competent to enstain itself; we will go into the Territory, apply the test, and see whether or not it shall be Free or Slave.

DESPORACY AS IT WAS.

Gentlemen, let me reads few Det occasio platforms, to show how this thing went along. I will read you the Democratic platform of 1852, two years before the passage of the Kansse-Nebraska bill, so far as it ten hes upon the subject of Slavery.

"That Congress has up power nuder the Constitution of the event state, and that such States are the sole and proper passage overlything appendicing to their own affairs not promitted by the Constitution to the state are the sole and proper passage overlything appendicing to their own affairs not promitted by the Constitution to the constitutions of the constitution of the constitution of the constitutions of constitutions of the constitutions of the constitution of the constitution

lead to the most alarming and dangerons consequence."

What say you to that, Democrats? Although you declared in black and white that it was dangerous to interfere with the subject of Shevery, what have you done? Did you not say it was dangerous to interfere a Answer me that, and let me go on? You are silout. You are condemned out of your own mouths. I pro-

ttical institutions."
" Brooked, That the foregoing proposition covers and was ended to embrace the whole subject of Slavery spitalion Mark that the words, "the whole subject," are i

Mark that the words, "the whole subject," are is small capitals in their reported resolutions.

"And, therefore, the Democratic party of the Union, standia upon their National platform, will abide by and adhere to a faith followenties of the acts known as the Compromise measures attied by the last Congress—the act for recidining of Squiton from service or laker included—which act, being designed to carry out the express provision of the Constinct in, cannot be repealed or so changed as to destroy or impair its-fibricancy."

"Resolved, That the Democratic party will resist all sitempt at recenting in Congress or out of it, the agitation of the Staves; question, under whatever shape or color the astecupit may be made."

These were the declarations and avoratio of the Democratic party in 1879. Now what do they defined the second colors.

These were the decisrations and avowais of the Democratic party in 1852. Now, what do they do in 1854? Why, they so under the leadership of Stephen A. Douglas, when he had made a report, asying that that law of 1820 was sacredly conceived in the Compromise of 1850, and repeal the Missouri Compromise. Now, Fbelieve, they stand condemned by their own language and by their own acts, and I have been accomplished what F proposed to do.

THE DEMOCRACY SELF-CONDENNED:

What was the result of all this? The result was that in obedience to the declaration that the people were to be fairly left to choose for themselves between Liberty and Slavery, they adopted another platform. Let me come to that. I wi itell you what they did in 1856, in that year the Cascinnati platform was adopted. In consequence of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, the Northern people interceded to get their own territory, upon the avowal made in the Emman. Nebraska bill, that the people were to "be left to form and regulate their domestic institutions for the United States. But netwithstanding that avowal it made, they immediately, as the report of the United States Gorgrees showed you, before a single Free-Soiler or Republican had set his foot into the now-territory, commenced on the border of Missouri the cryanization of the "Blue Leages," to invade Kansaa, with the avowed design—peaceably if they could, and forcibly if they must—to have that land for a Slave State, and "damn the Abolithenists, they would shoot them down as squirrels," as Pheard a leading Democrat express bimself is Lealington, while that conflict was gening on. They passed these resolutions in 1856, and I want you to pay a strict attention to these, in compari

Consection, under whatever shape or color the attempt may be made."

Oh yes! will resist. That is the Democratic doctrine in 1856 in Cincianati—did you alluda to it te-day.? Yee, you voted the doctrine down, and yet here it is, "that the Democratic party will resist all attempts at renewing, in Gorgress or out of it, the agitation of the Slavery question, under whatever shape or color the, attempt may be made." What do you say to that? There is the Gincianati platform which you eschawed to-day. You denounced as treascoulds any attempt to renew that agitation, under any shape whatever; let me, however, turn to another clause:

"4. That by the uniform application of this Democratic principle to the organization of Territories, and to the admission of new Stares, with a without Domestic Stavery, as they may elect; the equalrights of all the States will be preserved inact, the original compacts of the Constitution maintained invisites, and the perpetuity and expansion of the Union instead to the most capacity of smbracing, in peace and harmony, excey future American State that may be constituted or amexed, with a republican form of government."

But you ounit:

"S. Resolved, That claim of fellowable with, and destring the coperation of all who regard the proservation of the Union under the Constitution as the paramount issue, and repudiating all rections garties and platforms concerning Domestic Slavery, which seek to embroit the States, and to incitate transon and arm of resistance to law in the Territories, and and the organic laws establishing Kanasa and Nobresta Territories, is embodying the caly sound and safe solutions of the "Indon-Non-intervention by Congression State and Territory, or in the District of Columbia."

Oh! Mr. Graves, where are your resolutions? There, gentlemen, is your declaration, and to it you would not even allude to-day, and under the affects on the service of the whole country can repose in its determined conservation of the Union-Non-intervention by Congression State of Territory, What

make such a charge as that.

THE UMMADE ISSUE.

Well now, gentlemen, I am going to give you a clause, that if they had adopted to day, it would have put the thing so plain, that if you gave us Douglas we would catch you; if you gave us Toombs, we would catch you, and if you offered Breckinridge, we would catch you. You did not intend the Democratic party to know there was such a clause. As a man up our way, a preacher, a man of great good souse, but little or no education, would say, when reading the Bible, "Well, brethren, that is one of—if you please, this is—this is a bad place, and we will skip it." The Democratic party to-day found it; was a hard place, and skipped it [applause], so that it is no wonder they did not want me to go into that same hall, and that the lights were out, and is was all dark. Here is what they did. The Republican nor Abolition party, nor the Democratic party, have ever made an neue upon the resolution pareed to-day, and which was in the platform of 1856, it is simply as to the power of the people when they become a State. It is a self-evident truth, and they intend you to go home with it, with the thought that you begged the game, but you will find that the lien has gone, and you have put but the ass's skin into your pouch.

"Reselved. That we recognize the right of the seepie of the Torritories, including Kamas and Nebrasia, acting through the leading and fusly-appreced will of a majority of actual residents, and whenever the number of their inhabitants justices it, and whenever the number of their inhabitants justices it. Slavery, and be admitted into the Union upon terms of perfect equality with the other States." Who ever denied that I challenge Mr. Silvertooth, I challenge Occar Turner, or even Mr. Speaker Merriwether, te point me out a single recolution from the foundation of our Government to this day, in any portion of the Union section, my reading has been of no account.

THE KANSAS-KERRASKA BILL.

Take the case pow. I have read the platforment.